

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,388		07/25/2003	Manish Mangal	2225	3928
28005	7590	02/09/2006		EXAMINER	
SPRINT				FERGUSO	N, KEITH
6391 SPRIN KSOPHT01				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		KS 66251-2100		2683	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/627,388	MANGAL ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Keith T. Ferguson	2683			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THE MAILING Ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
· -	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 J</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This action for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ince except for formal matters, pro				
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati 9)□	Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or ion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the	wn from consideration. or election requirement. er. cepted or b) □ objected to by the E				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E					
	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	The state of the distance of the	7.00.071 OF TOTAL 1 OF TOZ.			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) D Notice 3) D Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/627,388 Page 2

Art Unit: 2683

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1,3-11,13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haller et al. in view of Bull et al.., newly recited reference.

Regarding claims 1,3 and 8, Haller et al. discloses a method (fig. 3) of allocating call processing resources (paragraph 0036 line 1 through paragraph 0038 line 8) comprising: receiving at a base transceiver station a signal sent wirelessly from a client station (paragraph 0036 lines 5-8), selecting through one specific base station controller of multiple base station controllers to which to route the signal from the base transceiver station (paragraph 0036 line 1 through paragraph 0038 line 8); and routing the signal from the base transceiver station to the selected specific base station controller (paragraph 0037 lines 1-17 and paragraph 0038 lines 1-8). Haller et al. differs from claim 1 of the present

invention in that it does not disclose the base station controller is selected based upon a characteristic of the signal. Bull et al. teaches a mobile station originate a (3GPP 24.008,9.2.9) call to a base station, the base station forwards the (3GPP 24.008,9.2.9) call to the BSC based upon the mobile originating (3GPP 24.008,9.2.9) call information (paragraph 0183 lines 1-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Haller et al. with the base station controller is selected based upon a characteristic of the signal in order for the base station to rout the originated call from the mobile station based upon the call service needed, which save resources and bandwidth from other BSCs by not routing the call through the other BSCs, as taught by Bull et al..

Regarding claims 4-6 and 14-16, Haller et al. discloses detecting particular content (call set up information) (inherent, as a Mobile identification number originated from the wireless user when registering with a wireless network before dialing a phone number to ma network, as taught in paragraph 0036 lines 5-8) of the signal (paragraph 0036 lines 5-8); and responsively selecting one controller based at least in part on the particular content of the signal (paragraph 0037 lines 1-17).

Regarding claims 7 and 17, Haller et al. discloses sending the signal into an IP network (packet-switched network) to the selected base station controller (paragraph 0042 lines 4-14).

Regarding claim 9, Haller et al. discloses a method (fig. 3) comprising receiving at a base transceiver station a first signal sent wirelessly from a client station (paragraph 0036

line 1 through paragraph 0038 line 8); selecting a first one of a specific base station controller of multiple base station controllers to which to route the first signal from the base transceiver station, (paragraph 0036 line 1 through paragraph 0038 line 8) and routing the first signal over a IP network (packet-switched network) from the base transceiver station to the first selected base station controller (paragraph 0042 lines 4-16); receiving at the base transceiver station a second signal sent wirelessly from a client station (paragraph 0042 lines 4-16); and selecting a second one of multiple base station controllers to which to route the second signal from the base transceiver station (paragraph 0042 lines 14-23), and routing the second signal over the packet-switched network from the base transceiver station to the second selected base station controller (paragraph 0042 lines 14-23). Haller et al. differs from claim 9 of the present invention in that it does not disclose the base station controller is selected based upon a characteristic of the signal. Bull et al. teaches a mobile station originate a (3GPP 24.008, 9.2.9) call to a base station, the base station forwards the (3GPP 24.008,9.2.9) call to the BSC based upon the mobile originating (3GPP 24.008,9.2.9) call information (paragraph 0183 lines 1-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Haller et al. with the base station controller is selected based upon a characteristic of the signal in order for the base station to rout the originated call from the mobile station based upon the call service needed, which save resources and bandwidth from other BSCs by not routing the call through the other BSCs, as taught by Bull et al..

Regarding claims 10,11,13,18 and 19 Haller et al. discloses a base transceiver station (paragraph 0034 and fig. 4 number 80) comprising: an antenna system configured to wirelessly receive signals from client stations (paragraph 0034 and paragraph 0036); and control logic tied locally to the antenna system (paragraph 0034), wherein the antenna system passes to the control logic the signals that the antenna system receives wirelessly from client stations (paragraph 0034 and paragraph 0036), and wherein the control logic in turn passes the signals to a remote base station controller (paragraph 0034 and paragraph 0036), wherein the control logic is arranged to select one of multiple remote base station controllers to which to route a given signal received by the antenna system (paragraph 0037, paragraph 0038 and paragraph 0042), and to then route the given signal to the selected remote base station controller

paragraph 0037, paragraph 0038 and paragraph 0042). Haller et al. further discloses selecting a first one of multiple base station controllers to which to route the first signal from the base transceiver station, (paragraph 0042 lines 8-16) and routing the first signal over a IP network (packet-switched network) from the base transceiver station to the first selected base station controller (paragraph 0042 lines 4-16); receiving at the base transceiver station a second signal sent wirelessly from a client station; and selecting a second one of multiple base station controllers to which to route the second signal from the base transceiver station (paragraph 0042 lines 14-23), and routing the second signal over the packet-switched network from the base transceiver station to the second selected base station controller (paragraph 0042 lines 14-23). Haller et al. differs from claims 10 and 19 of the present invention in that it does not disclose the base station controller is selected based upon a characteristic of the signal. Bull et al. teaches a mobile station originate a (3GPP 24.008,9.2.9) call to a base station, the base station forwards the (3GPP 24.008,9.2.9) call to the BSC based upon the mobile originating (3GPP 24.008, 9.2.9) call information (paragraph 0183 lines 1-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Haller et al. with the base station controller is selected based upon a characteristic of the signal in order for the base station to rout the originated call from the mobile station based upon the call service needed, which save resources and bandwidth from other BSCs by not routing the call through the other BSCs, as taught by Bull et al..

4. Claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haller et al. in view of Bull et al. as applied to claims 1 and 10 and in further view of Nakashima.

Regarding claims 2 and 12, the combination of Haller et al. and Bull et al. differs from claims 2 and 12 of the present invention in that they do not explicit disclose selecting the one base station controller based at least in part on a current time. Nakashima teaches at the time a mobile call has occurred, a base station controller is selected based upon its ability threshold to handle the call (paragraph 0013 lines 5-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made To modify the

combination of Haller et al. and Bull et al. with selecting the one base station controller based at least in part on a current time in order for the base station to select a base station controller based upon the bandwidth available when a call is placed by the wireless user, as taught by Nakashima.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Keith T. Ferguson whose telephone number is (571) 272-7865. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on (571) 272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 7

Keith Ferguson Art Unit 2683 January 31, 2006 KEITH FERGUSOM PRIMARY EXAMINE